

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**1. Request for Continued Examination**

The applicants respectfully request continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

5

2. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722).

Response:10 **Claims 1 and 7**

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include limitations directed to querying a current manufacture status of the optical component before the optical component is made. As stated in paragraph [Para 15], the MES monitors and records actual situations and conditions of a product on production lines, such as information about situations, 15 problems, etc., when the product is **produced by equipment during production** (*emphasis added*), and transmits the above-mentioned information to the server in real-time. Additionally, as stated in paragraph [Para 16], the MES transmits the latest production information to the server, and the customer can query the latest status of the product through an Internet connection. Therefore, the applicants believe that 20 amendments made to claims 1 and 7 introduce no new matter. Consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

As stated in paragraphs [0001] and [0009], Haraburda teaches a method and system for electronic tracking of packaging corresponding to a product in a package on a production line. Therefore, the applicants assert that the above-identified limitations 25 directed to querying the current manufacture status before the optical component is made are not anticipated by the product packaging taught by Haraburda.

Claims 2 and 8

Claims 2 and 8 have been amended to clarify that the optical component is a mask 30 used in a semiconductor process. As stated in paragraph [Para 16], the manufacture produces masks, and the customers instruct the manufacturer to produce masks required

by various chips. The applicant therefore believe that the amendments made to claims 2 and 8 introduce no new matter. Consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Additionally, as claims 2 and 8 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively,
5 claims 2 and 8 should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

Claims 3 and 9

Claims 3 and 9 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

10

Claims 13 and 14

Claims 13 and 14 have been amended in response to the above-identified amendments made to claims 1 and 7. No new matter is introduced. Consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

15

Claims 13 and 14 include limitations directed to a real-time update of the current manufacture status of the optical component before the optical component is made. In light of above statements under Claims 1 and 7, the applicants assert that this feature is not anticipated by Haraburda.

Additionally, claims 13 and 14 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and
20 should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722) in view of Hutchinson (US Patent 5,223,843)

25

Response:

Examiner states that Hutchinson teaches utilizing the global positioning system for transmitting the current position. The applicants disagree.

In col. 1, lines 31-41, Hutchinson teaches that the global positioning system enables determination of a user's position, and the user position is determined according to signals
30 from satellites. In other words, when the GPS receiver receives the signals from satellites, the position of the GPS receiver can be calculated and determined. However, Hutchinson merely discloses how the GPS receiver processes the signals received from satellites, and

there is no description pertinent to **transmitting** position information of the GPS receiver to a **database** on a server after the position of the GPS receiver has been determined. The applicants therefore assert that the claimed feature of using the global positioning system for transmitting the current position of the mask to the database is neither taught nor
5 suggested by Hutchinson. As a result, claims 4 and 10 are not disclosed by Haraburda in view of Hutchinson.

Additionally, claims 4 and 10 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

10 Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722) in view of Rodriguez et al. (US PG Pub 20050114690).

Response:

15 Examiner states that Rodriguez teaches utilizing the RFID system for detecting the chip to generate the position information and transmitting the position information to the database. The applicants disagree.

Rodriguez teaches scanning an RFID of an electronic device, transmitting the scanned RFID to a server, and then using an RFID database controller in the server
20 searches an RFID database for identification details of the electronic device corresponding to the scanned RFID (paragraph [0047]). In paragraph [0011], Rodriguez further discloses using a radio frequency reader to transmit a radio frequency signal for detecting the radio frequency identifiers (RFIDs) of electronic devices, where **the radio frequency identifier is read from a memory module** of an RFID tag. Therefore, according to Rodriguez's
25 disclosure, the radio frequency identifier contains identification information of an electronic device only and is stored in a memory module of an RFID tag on the electronic device. In other words, the radio frequency identifier includes no position information of the electronic device, and the RFID system taught by Rodriguez merely reads the radio frequency identifier from the memory module of an RFID tag. There is no description
30 pertinent to generating the position information of the electronic device by utilizing the RFID reader to detect the RFID tag on the electronic device.

In light of above statements, the applicants assert that the claimed feature of utilizing

the RFID system for detecting the chip to generate the positional information is neither taught or suggested by Rodriguez. Therefore, claims 5 and 11 are not disclosed by Haraburda in view of Rodriguez. Additionally, claims 5 and 11 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

5

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722) in view of Beverina et al. (US PG Pub 20010027389).


Response:

10 Claims 6 and 12 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15

Sincerely yours,

Date: 06/07/2007

20 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

25

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)